

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Stafford Kears, #241166,)	
)	C.A. No. 9:09-1031-HMH-BM
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	OPINION AND ORDER
)	
Warden Padula, Lee C.I. Warden;)	
Ryan B. Hutchinson, M.D.; Russell)	
D. Kitch, Ent. Ontolaryngology; LoBette)	
Singleton, Nurse; Dr. Brill, Ent.; Warden)	
Bell, Assoc. Warden, Lee C.I.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006).

The Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to

give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The court must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Marchant’s Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein. It is therefore

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion for a voluntary dismissal, docket number 31, is granted and Defendants Kitch, Singleton, and Hutchinson are dismissed as party Defendants with prejudice. Based on the above, Defendant Kitch’s motion for summary judgment, docket number 25, is moot. It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s claim for inadequate or improper medical care is dismissed with prejudice, and Defendant Brill is dismissed as a party Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
September 3, 2009

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.